

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 14, 17, and 19 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, 14, 17, and 19 are now amended. Claims 3, 9, 11-13, 15-16, 18 and 20 are cancelled. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Akahira et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981). Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,501,663). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part, and with reference to Figures 4-6 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, “forming a central part of the film pattern [W1] by depositing a plurality of first droplets spaced apart from each other on the substrate and depositing second droplets in spaces between the first droplets;” “forming one side [W2] with respect to the formed central part by depositing a plurality of third droplets spaced apart from each other on the substrate and depositing fourth droplets in spaces between the third droplets;” and “forming the other side [W3] with respect to the formed central part by depositing a plurality of fifth droplets spaced apart from each other on the substrate and depositing sixth droplets in spaces between the fifth droplets.”

Amended Claim 10 is similar to amended Claim 1. Claim 10 recites a method for manufacturing a device having a linear wiring pattern, rather than a linear film pattern as recited in Claim 1.

Amended Claim 14 recites, in part, and with reference to Figures 4-6 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments; “discharging a set of linearly spaced apart second droplets on the substrate, the second droplets filling in gaps between the first droplets;” “discharging a set of linearly spaced apart fourth droplets on the substrate, the fourth droplets filling in gaps between the third droplets;” and “discharging a set of linearly spaced apart sixth droplets on the substrate, the sixth droplets filling in gaps between the fifth droplets.”

The Akahira reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figures 15 and 16, depositing a plurality of droplets sequentially in a straight line, each line having a width equal to the width of a single droplet. The Akahira reference fails to disclose or suggest forming a film or wiring pattern using the three specific steps set forth in independent Claims 1 and 14. Therefore, the Akahira reference fails to anticipate or render obvious Claims 1 and 14 and those claim dependent therefrom. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of his Section 102 rejection of Claims 1 and 14 and those Claims dependent therefrom.

The Pan reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 15, forming a plurality of rows of film patterns. A first side pattern 153 is formed first. A middle pattern 155 is formed second. A second side pattern 157 is formed third. The Pan reference fails to disclose or suggest forming a film or wiring pattern using the three specific steps set forth in independent Claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the Pan reference

fails to anticipate or render obvious Claims 1 and 10 and those claim dependent therefrom. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of his Section 102 rejection of Claims 1 and 10 and those Claims dependent therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahira et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981) as applied to Claim 1 above and further in view of Ohtsu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,720,119). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 is dependent upon independent Claim 1. As set forth above, Claim 1 is not obvious in light of the cited art. Therefore, Claim 7 is also not obvious in light of the cited art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of Claim 7.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 30, 2008

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/BGS/cn]